

# **EXHIBIT 17**

## **REDACTED**

## Message

**From:** [REDACTED]@google.com]  
**Sent:** 11/19/2014 3:22:35 PM  
**To:** [REDACTED]@google.com]  
**CC:** [REDACTED]@google.com]; [REDACTED]@google.com]; [REDACTED]@google.com]; [REDACTED]@google.com]; [REDACTED]@google.com]  
**Subject:** Re: RPO launch

I've put together a proposal for how to handle buyer exemptions from dynamic pricing. Hope to iterate on it with [REDACTED] and if he's happy have [REDACTED] review it with competition council. Feedback appreciated.

[REDACTED]

On Tue, Nov 18, 2014 at 2:59 PM, [REDACTED]@google.com> wrote:  
As you can see, we have some implementation details to hammer out :)

One definition I can think of: simulate auction where [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Another definition: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Yet another definition: [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

I think I'll just list a few options, and implement whatever option meets the least resistance, breaking ties by popular support :)

On Tue, Nov 18, 2014 at 1:56 PM, [REDACTED]@google.com> wrote:  
How do we know they are valid second bid?

On Tue, Nov 18, 2014 at 1:55 PM, [REDACTED]@google.com> wrote:  
Update: [REDACTED] and I met with [REDACTED]

Redacted - Privilege

# Redacted - Privilege

On Mon, Nov 17, 2014 at 11:40 PM, [REDACTED]@google.com> wrote:  
Thanks [REDACTED] for the summary. A few notes from my conversations with folks (and the review itself)

- [REDACTED] asked if AdWords could legally be exempted from RPO when buying from AdSense pubs. Have a thread with [REDACTED] on this, will add more folks to it.

- As mentioned, [REDACTED] is worried about Bernanke + DRPO interaction. One way to make him happy is to ensure the dynamic prices [REDACTED]

- [REDACTED] wants to tune the tradeoff between [REDACTED]
- In the review, [REDACTED] suggested [REDACTED] as a feature to slice by. (Good idea, not top priority)
- The idea of applying dynamic price to [REDACTED] hasn't been discussed in the review, but it's something I definitely want to follow up on (assuming [REDACTED] doesn't shoot it down).

As expected, [REDACTED] declared high level philosophical questions out of scope of this review.

On Mon, Nov 17, 2014 at 8:27 PM, [REDACTED]@google.com> wrote:

We had the CAQ review today, with [REDACTED] The main sticking point is concern that we are launching another mechanism (RPO) [REDACTED]

Two things we'll follow up with that might help:

- [REDACTED] [REDACTED] was going to do this and we'll pick it up again
- [REDACTED] and might be ok from a legal perspective - I'm discussing with [REDACTED] tomorrow.

On 15 November 2014 15:11, [REDACTED]@google.com> wrote:

I agree the argument is ridiculous which is why I will fight it tooth and nail.

On Nov 14, 2014 10:40 PM, [REDACTED]@google.com> wrote:

A quick simulation I did in preparation for the launch review says with a [REDACTED] model we lose about [REDACTED] of the revenue impact. I personally think this demand is actually harmful to buyers [REDACTED]

The argument that I'm not supposed to use bids submitted is ridiculous. Dynamic GDN revshare, Bernanke, and the dynamic sell side revshare we're about to launch all charge the winner their bid when it falls into the dynamic region. That means we are \*already\* using a buyer's bid to price them on the very same query. In contrast, I'm only using historical data to set the price, and I transparently send the floor in the bid request.

I'm scheduled for a CAQ review on Monday; here's my launch plan:

I can generate talking points, could use help packaging them into a deck.

On Fri, Nov 14, 2014 at 9:32 PM, [REDACTED]@google.com> wrote:

[REDACTED] - let's talk Monday about how best to get this through the gauntlet ahead.

On Fri, Nov 14, 2014 at 6:34 PM, [REDACTED]@google.com> wrote:

██████████ will not flip till we get VP approval since this uses ██████████ I disagree we need to get a doc/deck whatever going that explains the experiment and email ██████████ - if they ask for a meeting we can schedule.

██████████ - I assume you own this - can you get this done by Tuesday?

They are als that say can't use the ██████████ of data - how much does that impact us?